

REMARKS

Claims 34-47 remain in the subject application with claim 34 in independent format.

In a teleconference with Examiner Self on August 3, 2004, the Examiner verified that the amendments to the specification submitted with the Preliminary Amendment of November 18, 2003 were received by the USPTO. The Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4) because the reference character "20" designated both the rail and the table. In the Preliminary Amendment, the reference character "20" was corrected to refer only to the table and the rails were referred to as reference characters "28" and "30". Therefore, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) for not including the reference character "18". Similarly, the Preliminary Amendment cancelled the reference character "18" from the specification and the objection should be withdrawn.

The drawings stand further objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for failing to show details described in the specification, specifically, page 6, lines 22 and 23 referring to Figures 11 and 12. Applicant submits herewith a replacement sheet for Figures 11 and 12. Referring to Figure 11, the reference character "96" has been deleted and replaced with reference character "84" as described in the specification on page 6, lines 22 and 23. Further, the reference characters "80" and "82" have been added to more clearly illustrate the description. Referring to Figure 12, the reference character "80" has been deleted and replaced with reference character "84" as described in the specification on page 6, lines 22 and 23. Further, the reference characters "80" and "82" have been added to more

Applicant: J. Richard Logan
Serial No.: 10/715,811
Reply to Office Action Dated: June 15, 2004
Response Dated: August 27, 2004
Page 6 of 7

clearly illustrate the description. It is believed that these drawing corrections overcome the objection.

Claims 34-47 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of United States Patent No. 6,705,192. Applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer overcoming the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Therefore, claims 34-47 are deemed allowable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Application, as amended, is now presented in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully solicited. Applicant believes that no fees are due, however, if any become required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2789.

Respectfully submitted

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.

August 27, 2004

Date



Kristopher K. Hullberger, Reg. No. 53,047
The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite #101
39400 Woodward Avenue
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
(248) 645-1483